DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 560 EA 021 188

AUTHOR Rose, Terry L.
TITLE Current Disciplinary Practices in American Public Schools.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Modification; *Discipline; *Discipline Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; In School Suspension; Positive Reinforcement; Public Schools; Suspension; Timeout; Token Economy; Values Clarification

ABSTRACT

This study describes the uses of several disciplinary practices in American public schools. They include positive reinforcement, tokens, assertive discipline, timeout, values clarification, life span interviews, behavior charts, conferences, detention, remaining after school, inschool suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and exclusion. Three hundred and seventy-one principals in 18 randomly selected states representing the 9 United States Census districts received a school discipline survey. Twenty-six school principals (70 percent) returned usage information. Results indicated differential uses of the several disciplinary practices. The study provides and discusses descriptions of the use of these disciplinary practices across general, demographic, and behavioral variables. Implications for personnel preparation are also discussed. (4 tables and 30 references) (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309560

Current Disciplinary Practices in American Public Schools

Terry L. Rose, Ph.D.
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terry L. Rose

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Preparation of this manuscript was supported in part by a research grant awarded by the University of North Carolina at Charlotte Foundation. Address all correspondence to Dr. Terry L. Rose, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC 28223.

1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 021 188

Abstract

The uses of several disciplinary practices, including positive reinforcement, tokens, assertive discipline, time-out, values clarification, life space interviews, behavior charts, conferences, detention, remaining after school, in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and exclusion are described. A school discipline survey was mailed to 371 principals in 18 randomly selected states representing the nine U.S. Census districts. Results indicated differential uses of the several disciplinary practices. Descriptions of the use of these disciplinary practices across general, demographic, and behavioral variables are provided and discussed. Implications for personnel preparation are discussed.

Current Disciplinary Practices in American Public Schools

Maintaining discipline in the schools may have been an issue since public education began (Viti, 1987). Evidence of the general public's continuing concern over discipline problems in schools has been demonstrated by their ranking it as the number one problem in the public schools for sixteen of the last eighteen years (Gallup, 1986). Politicians increasingly call for get-tough disciplinary policies as the cure for many of education's and society's problems (Kraig, 1987). Teachers, too, view disciplinary problems as a significant concern, as evidenced by a recent survey that found that 49% of the responding teachers thought that school discipline was either a very serious or fairly serious issue (Gallop, 1984). But, despite the interest and concern generated by this issue, the question remains: What procedures or set of procedures constitute effective discipline?

A variety of disciplinary practices have been suggested, ranging from the biblical admonition about sparing the rod and spoiling the child to more positive, child-directed procedures (e.g., Williamson, 1987). Responses to the perceived discipline problem in public schools have recently been characterized as a "cookbook" approach (McLaughlin & Matczynski, 1987), in which various steps are outlined that will lead to an effective, efficient, smooth running classroom (cf. Gans, 1965; McDaniel, 1986). A number of disciplinary procedures have been developed that depend in varying degrees on conceptual models ranging from Rogerian

to Skinnerian (Wolfgang & Glickman, 1980). Despite the numerous suggestions regarding programs that lead to effective discipline, several disciplinary procedures seem to have become more widely accepted than others. Consequently, these were included in the current study and are discussed briefly below.

Applied behavior analysis procedures, as first described by Baer, Wolf, and Risley in 1968, has provided several procedures that are applicable to most classroom situations. Reinforcement procedures are among the most widely applied and successful principles of behavior (Cooper, Heron, & Heward, 1987). Positive reinforcement refers to the contingent occurrence of a consequence following a specified behavior that serves to increase or maintain that behavior. Several classes of positive reinforcers have been identified, including edible, tangible, exchangeable, activity, social, and sensory reinforcers (Rusch, Rose, & Greenwood, 1988). One of these, exchangeables or token systems, is a highly developed and researched set of procedures for changing behavior that has proven successful in a variety of settings (Cooper, et al., 1987). Token systems require three procedural steps: (a) identfication of the behaviors to be reinforced, (b) selection of a medium of exchange (the token), and (c) selection of the backup reinforcers for which the tokens can be exchanged (Kazdin, 1977). Time-out is a behavioral procedure that requires the withdrawal of the opportunity for the student to earn positive reinforcers for a specified period of time following the occurrence of a particular misbehavior (Foxx,

1982). This procedure, unlike positive reinforcement procedures described above, is designed to decrease behaviors.

Assertive Discipline is a widely advocated classroom management system that is comprised of the following philosophical principles: (a) teachers must have their needs met in the classroom, (b) no child should be allowed to prevent a teacher from teaching, (c) no child should be allowed to prevent another child from learning, and (d) teachers decide which behaviors are in the child's best interest (Canter, 1978, 1979). In order to realize these principles, teachers are expected to describe clearly behaviors that are expected to occur, the positive consequences that will follow the occurrence of those behaviors, and the negative consequences that will result if those behaviors do not occur. Based upon well-documented principles of applied behavior analysis, Assertive Discipline differs from applied behavior analysis in that it is a "packaged program" and the authors employ different terminology to describe applied behavior analysis procedures. While some characterize the program as being uncreative and dehumanizing (Frew, 1979) and few studies have been reported regarding the effects of Assertive Discipline, several authors have reported favorable results (Ersavas, 1981; Mandlebaum, Russell, Krouse, & Gonter, 1983).

Values clarification is offered as a procedure to help students develop a process of decision making about personal issues, such as authority and friendship. The process, rather than the values themselves, are taught (Simon, Howe, & Kirschenbaum, 1972). Simon,

et al., (1972) identified seven subprocesses of values clarification, including prizing and cherishing, publicly affirming, choosing after consideration of consequences, choosing from alternatives, choosing freely, acting, and acting with consistency and repetition. Apparently, only a few studies support many of the claims made about values clarification (Lockwood, 1978).

Life space interviewing was described by Redl (1959) as a reality-oriented interview procedure that teachers can use productively in the classroom to help children gain insight into their problems and learn new ways of coping with those problems by focusing the discussion on the patterns of behavior, emotions, and events that occurred during the time the teacher and student were actually together. Students are given the responsibility or helped to assume the responsibility for discovering alternative, adaptive responses (Morse, 1980). Life space interviewing procedures have shown some effectiveness, although relatively few studies have been reported (DeMagistris & Imber, 1980).

In-school suspension is a relatively recent response to a growing concern over some potential drawbacks of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions or exclusions (Chobot & Garibaldi, 1982; Harvey & Moosha, 1977; Osborne, 1977). Negative consequences of out-of-school suspensions and exclusions may include loss of instructional time, isolation from peers, encouraging dropouts, decreasing parental and community support, a loss of state aid based on average daily attendance, and an increase in daytime juvenile delinquency (Chobot & Garibaldi, 1982). In-school suspensions were

developed to counteract many of these negative side effects by providing instructional time and other support services, such as couseling, in the school context, while, at the same time, removing the misbehaving student from the regular school routine.

Little is known about the uses of these and other, possibly frequently used, disciplinary practices. There appears to be scant empirical support for most of the disciplinary procedures discussed above, yet they may be used widely. Few descriptive studies of the uses and administrative practices surrounding the use of these and other disciplinary practices were found by the author of the current study. For example, one survey of school disciplinary actions, based on parental reports, indicated that 63.4% of all suspensions were for behaviors that harmed neither persons nor property and that almost 25% were for truancy and/or tardiness (Children's Defense Fund, 1975). Over 60% of the respondents to a 1978 survey cited suspension and/or exclusion as a method to help students with attendance problems (American Association of School Administrators, 1979). Other behaviors that earned suspensions or exclusions include smoking, class disruptions, fighting, alcohol or drug use, and theft (Chobot & Garibaldi, 1982).

Given the paucity of empirical and descriptive information, more information is needed regarding the current uses of disciplinary practices in our schools. If teacher education programs are to be most effective, the realities of the workplace must be recognized and addressed, whether through in- or pre-service training. Knowing the types of disciplinary practices that teachers

are expected to employ (and, by implication, to be proficient with) may have significant implications for teacher educators at they prepare our future and current teachers. The purpose of the present study is to describe the reported uses of various disciplinary practices with students in American public schools.

Method

Selection of Respondents

The sample for the current study was selected in an attempt to replicate as closely as possible the sample from an earlier related study of school disciplinary practices with handicapped learners (Rose, 1984). The original sample selection procedure involved: (a) selecting randomly two states from each of the nine U.S. Census districts, (b) selecting randomly a total of 10 school districts from each of the 18 selected states, (c) mailing letters to those school superintendents, explaining the study and requesting a list of the principals in their district, and (d) selecting randomly principals from responding districts to receive the school discipline survey (cf, Rose, 1984). The same schools were selected for the current study plus an additional 47 schools whose districts did not respond in time to be included in the previous study. Thus, 371 schools were selected randomly from 18 randomly preselected states. The schools were controlled for grade level by selecting schools using the following approximate ratio: Elementary 2: Junior High 1: High School 1. No attempts to control other demographic variables (e.g., size of community, number of students, and sex of

principal) were made. Special schools (e.g., special education centers or vocational/technical schools) were excluded.

Each principal received a letter explaining the rationale of the study, the voluntary nature of their participation, the use of group data, and an offer to share results along with the school discipline survey form. No follow-up was performed, due to the impending end of the school year. Usable information was returned by 261 school principals (70.4%). Those who declined to participate or provided incomplete information were classified as nonusable responses.

Questionnaire

The school discipline survey asked for information about the respondents' demography and their expectations for their teachers' uses of various disciplinary practices, excluding corporal punishment for the purposes of the current report. It was designed to obtain a maximum of descriptive information with as little effort by the respondents as possible. Six of the 7 questions germane to this report were answered by selecting from two or more choices or required a yes-no response. The remaining item asked for information that could not be predicted (i.e., other disciplinary practices used in their schools).

Results

Data that describe the respondents to the school disciplinary survey and the reported uses of various disciplinary practices were compiled. Table 1 presents a frequency distribution of responses to the survey according to census regions. Table 2 presents the

respondent frequencies across the major descriptive variables and the proportion of those responses within each demographic variable.

Insert Table 1 about here

Insert Table 2 about here

When asked which of an array of disciplinary practices were used systematically in their schools (with space available for writing in other practices), the results depicted in Table 3 were obtained. Table 3 presents the percentage of principals identifying disciplinary procedures used in their schools that depended on the teacher as the primary agent, with little involvement by the principal. As may be seen in Table 3, assertive discipline, time-out, and reinforcement procedures were used most often by teachers. Few principals allowed teachers to act primarily to implement either in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, or exclusions. Detention, conferences, holding students after school or holding Saturday classes, and behavior charts were rarely identified as prevalent disciplinary practices.

Insert Table 3 about here

Demographic Results.

Demographic results include a description of the differrential uses of the various disciplinary practices when analyzed by personal, geographic, or school-related variables. These demographic data were analyzed using the chi-square procedure. Although statistical notation has been omitted from this report, results designated as significant were statistically significant at no higher than the $p = .01$ level. [1] The disciplinary practices are presented in an order that approximates a continuum from less intrusive or positive to more intrusive or aversive.

While these procedures are employed in a variety of locales and circumstances, differential effects were noted. As may be seen in Table 4, principals varied in their use and expectations for their teachers use of these disciplinary practices when viewed across the several independent variables of the study.

Insert Table 4 about here

Reinforcement. Significant differences were found regarding the relationship between the respondent's region and the uses of reinforcement procedures when teachers had primary responsiblity: with principals in the West South Central region more likely to expect teachers to use reinforcement and principals in the South Atlantic and Mountain regions less likely.

No significant differential effects were found when the relationship between uses of reinforcement and the principal's sex was analyzed. Nor were differences found when comparing on the basis of the principal's experience.

Teachers in schools in larger communities were most likely to be expected to implement reinforcement procedures. Teachers in the smallest communities were least likely to use reinforcement. When comparing on the basis of school-size, teachers in larger schools were more likely to use reinforcement.

Teachers in junior high schools were least likely to use reinforcement procedures.

Tokens. Regional differences were found in the use of token systems by teachers: principals in the West South Central region were most likely to expect teachers to implement token systems, while principals in the East South Central and Pacific regions were least likely.

Female principals were significantly more likely to expect their teachers to use token systems. No differences were noted when these data were analyzed by the principal's experience.

The size of the school's community, the school's size, and the school's grade-level were all related to differential uses of tokens. Teachers in schools in rural and very small communities were least likely to employ tokens as a disciplinary practice, while teachers in schools in the largest communities (over 500,000 pop.) were most likely. Principals of very small schools were least likely to expect teachers to use tokens, while those of medium-size

schools were most likely. In general, as the grade-level of the schools increased, the use of tokens by teachers decreased.

Values Clarification. Regional differences were found for the use of values clarification by teachers. Although values clarification was not used by the majority of schools in any region, the West South Central and Mountain regions contain the highest proportion of schools using this disciplinary procedure.

Male principals were signficantly less likely to expect their teachers to use values clarification techniques. No differential effects were found when these data were analyzed by the principal's experience.

The size of the school's community and the school's size were related to differential uses of tokens. Schools in the largest communities (over 500,000 pop.) were more likely to expect teachers to assume responsibility for using values clarification. Teachers in small schools (301-600 students) were more likely to be expected to use values clarification.

No differential effects were noted when these data were analyzed by the grade-level of the school.

Assertive Discipline. Regional differences were found when teachers had primary responsiblity for using assertive discipline: with the Middle Atlantic and Mountain regions least likely to have teachers implement assertive discipline.

The respondents' sex and years of experience were related to teachers' use of assertive discipline. Female principals were significantly more likely to expect teachers to implement assertive

discipline. Principals with the most experience (21 or more years) were significantly less likely to expect teachers to implement assertive discipline.

The size of the community in which the school was located and the size of the school were both significantly related to teacher's use of assertive discipline. Teachers in medium-size communities (5,000 - 50,000 pop.) more likely to use assertive discipline. Very small schools were less likely to expect teachers to use assertive discipline, while large schools (901-1200 enrollment) were more likely.

No differential uses of assertive discipline according to the grade-level of the respondents' school was found. Schools at every grade-level were equally likely to expect teachers to implement this disciplinary practice.

Time-Out. Regional differences were found in the use of time-out by teachers: schools in the New England and West South Central regions were most likely to expect teachers to employ time-out, while schools in the Middle Atlantic region were least likely.

Although no differences were found in the principals' expectations for implementation by their teachers when these data were analyzed by the principal's sex, the number of years of experience as a principal was related to differential expectations. Principals with the least experience (5 years or less) and most experience (more than 26 years) were most likely to expect their teachers to implement time-out.

Principals of schools in small (1,000-5,000 pop.) and very large (over 500,000 pop.) communities were most likely to expect teachers to implement time-out. No differential effects were noted for the relationship between school-size and uses of time-out by teachers.

As the grade-level of the school increased, the use of time-out by teachers decreased significantly.

In-School Suspension. Significant regional differences in the uses of in-school suspensions by teachers were obtained: principals in the South Atlantic and Pacific regions were most likely to allow teachers an active role in the use of in-school suspensions.

No differential effects were found when these data were analyzed controlling for the principals' sex. However, the number of years of experience as a principal was significantly related to differential effects. Principals with the most experience (more than 21 years) were most likely to allow teachers an active role in employing in-school suspensions.

The size of the community in which the school was located was significantly related to teachers' use of in-school suspensions. Teachers in schools in small communities (1,000-5,000 pop.) were least likely to implement in-school suspensions.

The size of the school was related to the teachers' use of in-school suspensions. Teachers in small schools (301-600 enrolled) were most likely to actively implement in-school suspensions, while teachers in the largest schools (more than 900 enrolled) were least likely to be allowed responsibility for this disciplinary practice.

As the grade-level of their school increases, the probability of teachers being expected to use in-school suspensions decreases.

Out-of-School Suspension. Principals were unlikely to allow teachers to actively implement out-of-school suspensions, regardless of their geographic region.

No differential effects were found when analyzing these data controlling for the principal's sex. However, principals with 1 to 5 years of experience and those with more than 20 years of experience were most likely to allow teachers to have an active role in administering out-of-school suspensions.

Principals of schools located in small (5,000-10,000 pop.), moderate (50,000-100,000 pop.), and very large (more than 500,000 pop.) communities were significantly less likely to allow teachers an active role in out-of-school suspensions. Principals in rural, very small (1,000-5,000 pop.), and medium-size (10,000-50,000 pop.) were signficantly less likely to assume an active role in implementing out-of-school suspensions.

Neither the size of the school nor its grade-level had a significant effect on whether teachers were expected to perform an active role in administering this disciplinary procedure.

Exclusion. Although no statisitcally significant regional differences were found for teacher's active involvement, the few principals that permitted teachers to assume an active role were only found in the South Atlantic, East South Central, and Pacific regions.

Principals of either sex were equally unlikely to allow teachers an active role in this procedure. The few principals that allowed teachers an active role in this disciplinary practice were most likely to have between 16 and 25 years of experience.

Principals of schools in every size community and every size school were equally likely to withhold permission for teachers to assume an active role in excluding students. But, the school's grade-level was related to whether the principal allowed a teacher to be an active participant in the exclusion practice; only principals of elementary schools permitted this type of participation.

Detention, After/Saturday School, Conferences, or Behavior Charts. No significant relationships between these disciplinary practices and regional, principal's sex or experience, community or school size, or grade-level variables were found for teachers.

Discussion

The findings of the current study describe many of the variables related to the uses of several disciplinary practices in American public schools. Even though the major purpose of the current study was descriptive, rather than analytical, several general and demographic variables were identified that appear to be related to differential uses of these disciplinary practices.

Assertive discipline, time-out, reinforcement, in-school suspensions, and out-of-school suspensions were used by most schools. Exclusion was used in nearly half of the responding schools. Token systems and values clarification techniques were

used by a substantial minority of teachers. On the other hand, few teachers were expected to be actively involved in the administration of in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and exclusions. Life space interviews, detention, conferences, after school or Saturday school, and behavior charts do not appear to be prevalent disciplinary practices.

The reader should be aware of several limitations of the present study before further conclusions are drawn. First, to insure prompt and complete responses by the principals, relatively few items were included in the survey. And, these items may have restricted the range of answers that were possible because the respondents were forced to choose an answer from a preselected array of answers. Second, there was no follow-up with principals who did not respond within the requested time period, which resulted in variable response rates across regions. Third, questions regarding the generalizability of the present findings are related to the adequacy of the sample size. Fourth, detention, conferences, after/Saturday school, and behavior charts were not listed on the school discipline survey. These practices were written in by individual principals under the "other" category. Perhaps if they had been included on the survey form, they may have generated higher response rates.

Despite the various limitations, the present study documents the uses of various disciplinary practices with students in public schools in the United States. Therefore, several tentative

conclusions may be drawn regarding the uses of these disciplinary practices.

It seems clear that the types of disciplinary practices used in any given school may be a function of where and in what size community that school is located, the principal's sex and the number of years of he or she had been a principal, and the grade-level of the school. While these variables may be adequate for descriptive purposes, they do not allow an analysis of why certain disciplinary practices are selected.

Even though several disciplinary practices seem to be more widely used, there is a great deal of variability that may not be explained by any empirical evidence. As noted previously, few studies have investigated the relative effects of most of the disciplinary practices represented in this study, including those that are among the most popular (i.e., assertive discipline, in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and exclusions). Conversely, one of the most well documented disciplinary procedures (i.e., tokens) was not used by the majority of teachers.

We may conclude, then, that the data presented in the current paper are most appropriate for describing the status of the uses of several disciplinary practices in American public schools. However, these findings also clearly indicate a need for systematic investigations of the various parameters of these disciplinary practices, especially assertive discipline, values clarification, in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, and exclusions. Because functional relationships between variables cannot be

identified using the present data, a large number of investigative questions remain unanswered. For example, the effectiveness of these disciplinary practices still remain to be documented. A related issue refers to the relative efficiency of each disciplinary procedure, in terms of the time required to implement each procedure. Other experimental questions may include (A) the decision processes principals employ when selecting a disciplinary practice to be employed systematically in their school, (B) a description of the expectations for students during times spent in in-school and out-of-school supensions (e.g., routine classwork, additional punitive classwork, or counseling), and (C) expectations for students during exclusion periods (e.g., the availability of alternative schools).

Several implications for instructional personnel may be inferred from the current data. First, a critical implication for teachers and principals is the need to document the effectiveness and efficiency of any disciplinary procedure. Teachers should be encouraged and taught to collect data on the effects of any disciplinary procedure on the specific behaviors to which it is applied. Second, teachers should be encouraged to institute the most positive discipline practices possible. More intrusive procedures may be implemented later on an individual basis, if necessary. Third, pre-service and in-service education regarding several of these disciplinary practices may need to be emphasized. Since most, or a sizable minority of, principals expect their teachers to implement assertive discipline, time-out, reinforcement

procedures, token systems, and values clarification, teacher educators should take steps to ensure that both new and veteran teachers are well skilled in these disciplinary practices. In addition, many principals expected their teachers to be actively involved in implementing in-school suspensions. The goals and specific practices of any in-school suspension program should be carefully examined as part of a teacher's professional education. On the other hand, life space interviews, detention, conferences, after school or Saturday school, and behavior charts do not appear to be prevalent disciplinary practices. Consequently, in the absence of data that indicate these practices are effective, perhaps proportionately less time should be spent training teachers to use these procedures.

Even though discipline remains a critical problem in most schools, we, as teacher educators, can begin to contribute solutions to this problem by providing our students with the skills necessary to implement the procedures most frequently expected of them. Conversely, we may be seen as remiss in our responsiblities if we continue to expect teachers to learn these skills "on-the-job". We have the knowledge base and the resources to provide these skills. Should questions remain regarding our commitment?

References

American Association of School Administrators (1979). Keeping students in school: Problems and solutions. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Baer, D.M., Wolf, M.M., & Risley, T.R. (1968). Current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1, 91-97.

Canter, L. (1978). Taking charge of student behavior. National Elementary Principal, 58 (4), 33-41.

Canter, L. (1979). Competency-based approach to discipline - It's assertive. Thrust, 8 (3), 11-13.

Children's Defense Fund (1975). School suspensions: Are they helping children? Cambridge, MA: Children's Defense Fund.

Chobot, R.B., & Garibaldi, A. (1982). In-school alternatives to suspension: A description of ten school district programs. The Urban Review, 14, 317-337.

Cooper, J.O., Heron, T.E., & Heward, W.L. (1987). Applied behavior analysis. Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.

DeMagistris, R.J., & Imber, S.C. (1980). The effects of life space interviewing on academic and social performance of behaviorally disordered children. Behavior Disorders, 6, 117-119.

Ersavas, C.M. (1981). The effect of assertive discipline at four elementary schools (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 473-A. (University Microfilms No. 81-14739).

Foxx, R.M. (1982). Decreasing behaviors of severely retarded and autistic persons. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Frew, T.W. (1979). Review of assertive discipline in the classroom by L. Canter. Behavioral Disorders, 4, 143-144.

Gallup, A.M. (1984). The Gallup poll of teachers' attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 97-107.

Gallup, A.M. ((1986). The 16th Gallup poll on the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 43-59.

Gans, R. (1965). Five steps toward that all important quality: Good classroom discipline. Grade Teacher, 83, 169-171.

Harvey, D.L., & Moosha, W.G. (1977). In-school suspension: Does it work? NASSP Bulletin, 61 (405), 14-17.

Kazdin, A.E. (1977). The token economy: A review and evaluation. New York: Plenum Press.

Kraig, G.M. (1987). A rational approach for school discipline. Proteus, 4 (1), 42-44.

Lockwood, A.L. (1978). The effects of values clarification and moral development curricula on school-age subjects: A critical review of recent research. Review of Educational Research, 48, 325-364.

Mandlebaum, L.H., Russell, S.C., Krouse, J., & Gonter, M. (1983). Assertive discipline: An effective classwide behavior management program. Behavioral Disorders, 8, 258-264.

McDaniel, T.R. (1986). A primer on classroom discipline: Principles old and new. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 63-67.

McLaughlin, M.A., & Matczynski, T.J. (1987). Permissiveness: An old, a new, or an invalid idea. Proteus, 4 (1), 15-18.

Morse, W.C. (1980). Worksheet on life space interviewing. In N.J. Long, W.C. Morse, & R.G. Newman (Eds.), Conflict in the classroom: The education of emotionally disturbed children (4th ed.), (pp. 267-271). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1980.

Osborne, D.L. (1977). Race, sex, achievement, and suspension. Urban Education, 12, 345-347.

Redl, F. (1959). Mental hygiene and teaching. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Rose, T.L. (1984). Current uses of corporal punishment in American public schools. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 427-441.

Rusch, F.R., Rose, T.L., & Greenwood, C.R. (1988). An introduction to applied behavior analysis in special education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Simon, S., Howe, L., & Kirschenbaum, H. (1972). Values clarification. New York: Hart.

Viti, L.S. (1987). Discipline in the public schools: Recent developments in education law. Proteus, 4 (1), 37-41.

Williamson, M.E. (1987). Disciplining with peace: A unique idea for schools. Proteus, 4 (1), 6-8.

Wolfgang, C.H., & Glickman, C.D. (1980). Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Footnote

[1] A more detailed report of the results is available from the author.

TABLE 1

Response Frequencies of Respondents

	Number in Pool	Responses from Pool n	%
Region			
New England	22	15	68.2
ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT			
Middle Atlantic	32	24	75.0
NY, NJ, PA			
East North Central	49	36	73.5
OH, IN, IL, MI, WI			
West North Central	41	26	63.4
MN, IA, MO, ND, SD, NB, KS			
South Atlantic	58	49	84.5
DE, MD, DC, VA, WV, NC, SC, GA, FL			
East South Cental	47	29	61.7
KY, TN, AL, MS			
West South Central	33	18	54.5
AR, LA, OK, TX			
Mountain	46	29	63.0
MT, ID, WY, CO, NM, AZ, UT, NV			
Pacific	43	35	81.4
WA, OR, CA, AK, HI			
Total	371	261	70.4

Table 2

Respondent Characteristics

	Responses	Proportion This Variable
Community Size		
Rural	20	7.7%
Under 1,000	13	5.0%
1,000-5,000	36	13.8%
5,000-10,000	51	19.6%
10,000-50,000	43	16.6%
50,000-100,000	40	15.4%
100,000-500,000	41	15.8%
500,000 or more	15	5.7%
TOTAL	259	100.0%
School Size		
Less than 300	37	14.1%
301-600	124	47.5%
601-900	53	20.3%
901-1200	20	7.6%
More than 1200	27	10.3%
TOTAL	261	100.0%

Table 2 Continued

	Responses	Proportion This Variable
Grade Level		
Elementary (K-5 or 6)	133	50.9%
Junior High/Middle	43	16.4%
High School	71	27.2%
Other (K-8, K-12)	14	5.3%
TOTAL	261	100.0%
Principal's Experience		
First year	14	5.5%
2-5 Years	48	18.8%
6-10 years	67	26.3%
11-15 years	43	16.9%
16-20 years	46	18.1%
21-25 years	22	8.6%
More than 26 years	14	5.5%
TOTAL	254	100.0%

Table 3

Disciplinary Practices Implemented By Teachers

Disciplinary Practice	Percent Yes	Percent NO
Assertive Discipline	71.4	28.6
Time Out	52.1	47.8
Reinforcement	51.7	48.2
Values Clarification	30.5	69.4
Tokens	30.5	69.4
In-School Suspensions	10.0	89.9
Life Space Interviews	8.8	91.1
Out-of-School Suspensions	8.4	91.5
Detention	7.0	92.9
Exclusion	3.4	96.5
Conferences	2.3	97.6
After School/Saturdays	1.9	98.0
Charts	0.0	100.0

Table 4

Likelihood of Using Disciplinary Practices by Demography *

	Region							
Disciplinary Practice	NE	MA	ENC	WNC	SA	ESC	WSC	MTN	PA
Assertive Discipline		0		+	+	+		0	+
Time-Out	+	0					+		
Reinforcement					0		+	0	
Values Clarification	0	0					+	+	
Tokens	+	0					+		
In-School Suspend.	0			0	+	0	0	0	+

	Principals' Sex	
Disciplinary Practice	Male	Female
Assertive Discipline		+
Values Clarification	0	
Tokens		+

Principals' Experience

Table 4

Likelihood of Using Disciplinary Practices by Demography *

	Region								
Disciplinary Practice	NE	MA	ENC	WNC	SA	ESC	WSC	MTN	PA
Assertive Discipline		0		+	+	+		0	+
Time-Out	+	0					+		
Reinforcement					0		+	0	
Values Clarification	0	0					+	+	
Tokens	+	0					+		
In-School Suspend.	0			0	+	0	0	0	+

	Principals' Sex	
Disciplinary Practice	Male	Female
Assertive Discipline		+
Values Clarification	0	
Tokens		+

	Principals' Experience						
Disciplinary Practice	1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	25+
Assertive Discipline						0	0
Time-Out	0	0					0
In-School Suspend.						+	+
Out-of-School Suspend.		+				+	+
Exclusion		+			+	+	

	Community Size				
Disciplinary Practice	Rural	Under 1,000	1,001 5,001	10,001 50,001	100,001 500,000+
Assertive Discipline			+	+ 0	
Time-Out		0	+	0	+
Reinforcement	0	0			+ +
Values Clarification	0		0		
Tokens	0	0			+
In-School Suspend.		0	+ 0		0
Out-of-School Suspend.			0	0	0

	School Size				
Disciplinary Practice	300	600	900	1,200	1,200+
Assertive Discipline	0			+	
Reinforcement	**	**	**	**	**
Values Clarification	0	+		0	
Tokens	0		+		
In-School Suspend.		+		0	0

	Grade-Level		
Disciplinary Practice	Elem.	JrHi	High
Time-Out	***	***	***
Reinforcement		0	
Tokens	***	***	***
In-School Suspend.	***	***	***

NOTES:

* Disciplinary practices more likely to occur are indicated by a "+" and those less likely to occur are indicated by a "0". Only those disciplinary practices that achieved statistical significance are listed in Table 4.

** The larger the school, the more likely this disciplinary practice would be employed.

*** As grade-level of the school increased, the less likely this disciplinary practice would be employed.